

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 30-33 and 35-62 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 30, 35, 37-38, 44, 48-51, 55, and 57-58 are amended, and claim 62 is added. No new matter is added. Support for the claims can be found throughout the specification, including the original claims, and the drawings. In particular, the Examiner is directed to page 9, lines 12-13 and 34-35. Reconsideration in view of the above amendments and following remarks is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejected claims 30, 35, 37-38, 44, 48-49, 55, and 57-58 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed. Referring to the Examiner's comments, it is respectfully submitted that, as indicated in the claims, the integral parser comprises the word parser and the syntax parser. Accordingly, the rejection should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claims 30-33, 38-54, and 57-59 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sahota et al. (hereinafter "Sahota"), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0056460, and further in view of Mackie et al. (hereinafter "Mackie"), U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0054535. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 30 has been amended to recite, *inter alia*, a syntax parser that parses a plurality of syntax of the web-document on the basis of the tokens and a contents model, generates a tree-based object on the basis of a graphic user interface (GUI) of the handheld terminal, the tree-based object corresponding to the application program, performs a mapping

operation so as to represent a GUI model of a specific markup language by the GUI of the handheld terminal regardless of the specific markup language, and thereby matches the parsed markup web-document to the GUI of the handheld terminal, wherein the word parser separates all of the tokens of a document supplied to the integral parser on the basis of markup and non-markup by using the token table and the syntax parser ignores only a markup portion of the element that is not supported by the handheld terminal, including a tag name (element type) and attributes (attribute list), and browses a non-markup portion, including parsed character data for a user. Sahota does not disclose or suggest such features, or the claimed combination of independent claim 30.

Accordingly, independent claim 30 defines over Sahota. Independent claims 38, 44, 48-49, and 57-58 recite features similar to independent claim 30, and thus, also define over Sahota. Mackie fails to overcome the deficiencies of Sahota, as it is merely cited for allegedly teaching wherein each different token is generated by a corresponding parser.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 30, 38, 44, 48-49, and 57-58 over Sahota and Mackie should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 31-33, 39-43, 45-47, 50-54, and 59 are allowable over Sahota and Mackie at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 30, 38, 44, and 48-49, from which they respectively depend, as well as for their added features.

The Office Action rejected claims 35-37, 55-56, and 60 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sahota, in view of Chadha et al. (hereinafter "Chadha"), U.S. Patent

Publication No. 2003/0184552. Again, it has been assumed for the purpose of this reply that the Examiner intended to reject these claims over Sahota, Mackie, and Chadha. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 35, 37, and 55 recite features similar to independent claim 30, and thus, also define over Sahota and Mackie. Chadha fails to overcome the deficiencies of Sahota and Mackie, as it is merely cited as allegedly teaching reading parsed character data until an end tag appears.

Accordingly, the rejection of independent claims 35, 37, and 55 over Sahota, Mackie, and Chadha should be withdrawn. Dependent claims 36 and 56 are allowable over Sahota, Mackie, and Chadha at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claims 35 and 55, from which they respectively depend, as well as for their added features.

Dependent claim 60 is allowable over Sahota and Mackie at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 58, from which it depends, as well as for its added features. Chadha fails to overcome the deficiencies of Sahota and Mackie, as it is merely cited as allegedly teaching the specific claimed feature of dependent claim 60. Accordingly, the rejection of dependent claim 60 over Sahota, Mackie, and Chadha should be withdrawn.

The Office Action rejected claim 61 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Sahota in view of Web Design Group comments. Again, it has been assumed for the purpose of this reply that the Examiner intended to reject this claim over Sahota, Mackie, and the Web Design Group. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Dependent claim 61 is allowable over Sahota and Mackie at least for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent claim 30, from which it depends, as well as for its added features. Further, the Web Design Group comments fail to overcome the deficiencies of Sahota, as it is merely cited for allegedly teaching the comments feature. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 61 over Sahota, Mackie, and the Web Design Group comments should be withdrawn.

It is respectfully submitted that added independent claim 62 also defines over the applied prior art.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. **10/539,762**

Docket No. **HI-0189**

Amendment dated October 28, 2010

Reply to Office Action of June 28, 2010

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,  
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



Carol L. Druzbeck  
Registration No. 40,287

P.O. Box 221200  
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200  
(703) 766-3777 CLD:pb

**Date: October 28, 2010**

\\Fk4\Documents\2019\2019-195\253838.doc

**Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610**